

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/733,725	KIM ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	DAVID E. ENGLAND	2443	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) DAVID E. ENGLAND. (3)_____

(2) M. Brad Lawrence Reg. No. 47210. (4)_____

Date of Interview: 10 March 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 2.

Identification of prior art discussed: Connor 6868466 and Connor 6993613.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/David E. England/
Examiner, Art Unit 2443

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative contacted the Examiner to discuss the claims and proposed claim amendments, i.e., claim 2 into claim 1. The Attorney of record stated that Connor 6993613 did not teach all three criteria that is needed for the interrupt to exit, more specifically the time interval. Examiner stated that this was stated in the proposed amendment nor in claim 2. What is stated is at least two criteria needs to happen in order to exit the interrupt. Connor 6993613 teaches everything but the time, which is what is stated in claim 2. Connor 6868466 teaches the time interval in multiple areas as stated in claim 2 but was not specifically relied upon. Examiner stated that if the Applicant wishes to submit an official amendment that they should make sure that all three criteria are stated to be met, if that is what they desire. The Examiner also stated that the Applicant must look at the other prior art to make sure that the amendment is not taught by the other prior art..